REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 13-32 are pending. Claims 1-12 were previously canceled. Claims 13, 14, 15, 20, 24, 25 and 28 are amended, and claims 29-32 are added. Claims 13, 24, and 28 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has recognized the Applicants' claim for foreign priority, based on receipt of certified copy of the priority document submitted by Applicants in the corresponding International Application.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 14-17 because of several informalities. In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended claims 14 and 15 in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 20 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soules et al. (U.S. 5,522,623), in view of Yoshihara et al. (U.S. 5,270,526);

claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soules et al. as modified by Yoshihara et al. in view of Rudland (U.S. 4,538,059); and

claims 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soules et al. as modified by Yoshihara as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hagstrom et al. (U.S. 6,354,502).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections but merely to advance the prosecution of the present application, each of independent claims 13, 24 and 28 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements, including

a security indicium comprising a pattern of a plurality of regions with various sizes, each of the regions in the security indicium being made of a first inking material and a second inking material which are disposed separately from each other,

the first inking material for giving out light in response to a first wavelength of incident light, and the second first inking material for giving out light in response to the second wavelength of incident light,

the light given out by the first inking material having a first wavelength different from a second wavelength, the light given out by the first inking material having the first wavelength and not having the second wavelength different from the first wavelength,

the light given out by the second inking material not having the first wavelength and having the second wavelength,

the first and second sheet members being opaque to visible light and transparent to the lights of the first and second wavelengths.

Independent Claims 13, 24, and 28 have the characteristic that the first inking material gives out light in response to a first wavelength of incident light, and the second first inking material gives out light in response to the second wavelength of incident light. In other words a different light from each of two light sources are included, with the light from one light source being detected from one inking material, and the light from the other light source being detected from the other inking material, the two inking materials being separate from each other. In addition, the security indicium comprises a pattern of a plurality of regions with various sizes and the first and second sheet members are opaque to visible light and transparent to the lights of the first and second wavelengths.

Because the security indicium is made with two different and separate light sources which project light onto two separate and independent inking materials, a card can be made with features that provide more effective safeguards against forgery than is possible with conventional cards.

With regard to the newly relied on Yoshihara reference, this reference describes a card such as a prepaid card wherein blocks for breaking to open holes are printed with two types of ink. Applicants submit that Yoshihara is different from the present invention for the following reasons and therefore fails to make up for the deficiencies of Soules:

1). Yoshihara describes generally using a plurality of types of ink having different optical characteristics; however, the purpose of the two types of ink is different from the presently claimed invention.

Specifically, Yoshihara requires that the two types of ink have the same visible color, but have different characteristics to infrared rays. One of the two types of ink has a large rate of reflection to infrared rays, but the other ink does not reflect infrared rays. As to infrared rays, this means there is only two states for a block whether the ink having a large rate of reflection is printed or not. The other ink is used for the blocks to have the same visible color as the first ink. It is assumed that the color of the blocks is different from the background of the surface of the card. Therefore, such ink is not needed if the blocks have the same color as the background. It is also to be noted that Yoshihara can use a different type of information whether a block is punched out to form a hole or not, and because two types of information not available in the

invention can be used, there would be no motive that the two inks have different infrared characteristics. On the other hand, the inks of the invention may have different colors in the visible region in order to detect different colors printed inside the card.

Though Yoshihara states that the ink is disposed in the middle layer of the card, such a structure is only explained in a paragraph in column 11, lines 40-43, and it is not explained in detail. In such a structure, it is not necessary for the inks to have the same visible color, but it is not described in the paragraph what inks are used.

2). Yoshihara's card has blocks of the same size. In the present invention, regions formed with the two types of ink have different sizes.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements and method steps as set forth in each of independent claims 13, 24, and 28 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Soules et al. Yoshihara and Hagstrom.

In addition to the above, Soules et al. is silent about two different inking materials and two light sources. The Examiner concedes that neither of Soules et al. nor Yoshihara suggests two light sources. While Hagstrom et al. teaches two light sources, the two Hagstrom et al. light sources 16 and 18 are focused onto a single area of the labeled component 12. See FIG. 1. There is no hint whatsoever in Hagstrom et al. that two light sources should be projected separately so as to interact with two separate inking materials disposed away from one another. In fact, since the two light rays of Hagstrom et al. are focused precisely on one single area, Hagstrom et al. teaches away from the presently claimed invention.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements and method steps as set forth in each of independent claims 13, 24, and 28 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Soules et al., Yoshihara, and Hagstrom et al., at least for the reasons explained above.

Therefore, claims 13, 24, and 28 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 29-32 are added. As can be seen in Hagstrom et al., this document fails to teach (for example) two lights projecting substantially parallel to each other, as set forth in claims 29 and 31.

The dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested. All claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____

James M. Slattery, # 28,380
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS:CTT/ags
0020-4893P